



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/461,900	12/15/1999	ERIC NACE	MCS-116-99	4419
27662	7590	03/01/2004	EXAMINER	
LYON & HARR, LLP 300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800 OXNARD, CA 93036			THOMSON, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	
DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004				

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/461,900	Applicant(s) NACE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William D. Thomson	2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 have been presented for examination.
2. Claims 1-40 have been rejected. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL AND NO CLAIMS ARE ALLOWED.

Drawings

3. The Objection to figures 1 and 2 are not withdrawn and stand. Applicant is respectfully reminded that the figures are to illustrate the claimed invention not which is known in the prior art. These figures do not illustrate the Applicant's invention as recited in claims 1-40. As for the fact that other applications have been issued not denoting the same drawing as shown in Figure 1 as prior art does not remove this objection since each case is examined on its own merit, separate from other examined cases. The mere fact that Applicant has stated that this figure is common to hundreds of issued patents provides ample support for Examiner upholding this objection. As for Figure 2, it merely show the well taught and depicted use of recording and replaying client transactions on and to a server. Again this is well established in the prior art. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See M.P.E.P. § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Amendment and Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 10, 2003 have been fully considered but since amendments have been provided that clearly change the scope of the claimed invention with arguments with respect to claims 1-40; the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection that follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Landan (739), Marullo et al. (398), 6,167,534 (Straathof et al.), Abbott et al. (463), Mongan et al. (982), Rowe (492), Dantressangle (120), Bromberg et al. (066), Sherman et al. (512), individually, in which they individually teach the limitations as recited in claims 1-40. Further claims 1-40 are

Art Unit: 2123

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being clearly anticipated by Chen et al. (932) since Chen et al. explicitly teaches the limitations in claims 1-40. As is clearly shown and delineated in each individual teaching, an equivalent filtering mechanism is provided in the server and the log is different and not the standard server log. The individual teachings of this separate log is to provide monitory and even logs for determining performance when using virtual or emulated client operations to test an application or web server.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record, P.T.O. 892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Careful consideration of this art is required prior to providing a response, including amendments or argument, to the instance Office Action.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 2123

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William D. Thomson whose telephone number is 703-305-0022. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-3:30 Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Teska can be reached on 703-305-9704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William Thomson
Primary Examiner
A.U. 2123

